

Date: Tue, 5 Jan 93 04:30:24 PST  
From: Ham-Policy Mailing List and Newsgroup <ham-policy@ucsd.edu>  
Errors-To: Ham-Policy-Errors@UCSD.Edu  
Reply-To: Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu  
Precedence: Bulk  
Subject: Ham-Policy Digest V93 #5  
To: Ham-Policy

Ham-Policy Digest                      Tue, 5 Jan 93                      Volume 93 : Issue                      5

Today's Topics:

430mhz band under th

Send Replies or notes for publication to: <Ham-Policy@UCSD.Edu>  
Send subscription requests to: <Ham-Policy-REQUEST@UCSD.Edu>  
Problems you can't solve otherwise to brian@ucsd.edu.

Archives of past issues of the Ham-Policy Digest are available  
(by FTP only) from UCSD.Edu in directory "mailarchives/ham-policy".

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text  
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official  
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

-----  
Date: Mon, 04 Jan 1993 14:06:03 EST  
From: uunet.ca!xenitec!lemsys!clemon@uunet.uu.net  
Subject: 430mhz band under th  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <1993Jan04.042108.17562@ssc.com>, Tad Cook writes:

> >You're right, I would apologize and attempt to change frequency, which might  
> >be impossible in Southern California if the single 440 MHz simplex frequency  
> >was in use. I feel like it \*IS\* the previous poster's right to operate  
> >simplex unintentionally on a repeater input. I feel like it is the previous  
> >poster's right to operate \*INTENTIONALLY\* on a repeater's input frequency  
> >PROVIDED IT IS NOT CAUSING INTERFERENCE TO ANOTHER QSO. While I may only  
> >be a No-Code, I can read English. All the regulations I have read and seen  
> ^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^  
> Geeze.....I thought we were discussing this with someone who has long  
> and distinguished experience with frequency coordination and FM repeaters!  
>  
> Not to diminish the talents or abilities of a new ham, but it might

Too late.

> be a good idea to ask some questions about the subject, rather than  
> making all of these dire pronouncements based upon armchair lawyering!  
>  
> e

I don't see a smily above so you can interpret this however you want. Whether a ham does or does not know Morse Code does not at all affect his intelligence, ability to read, ability to understand or ability to have an opinion. Geez, I thought we were all hams, all one big happy family! (becoming one has sure changed my opinion). Why are hams constantly stabbing each other in the back, playing dirty pool, talking down to others and always trying to make themselves appear superior to others. I don't quite understand. I know of some Advanced, 12wpm hams that couldn't find their way out of a wet paper bag (and I'd prefer if they didn't) and also some Basic's who are the smartest, most curteous hams I know. Their license class allows them to do what they want, so they don't upgrade. They feel that they shouldn't bother learning Morse if they never plan to use it.

The point is, no one should be judged by license class, age, hair colour, size etc... I get a lot of hard times because I'm young (relative to our average ham population). So I haven't made 1000's of QSO on 80. So what!? That doesn't make me stupid or a waste of skin. Just my opinions coming through here. If I have misinterpreted your message and it was intended to be somewhat humourous, I'm sorry, but my opinions on the issue still stand.

--

Craig Lemon VE3XCL (Advanced) - Kitchener, Ontario. +1 519 741 0297  
clemon@lemsys.UUCP clemon@lemsys@xenitec.on.ca | 1B Electrical Engineering  
TCP/IP: ve3xcl@ve3xcl.ampr.org [44.135.84.51] | University of Waterloo  
AX.25 Packet: ve3xcl@ve3euk.#SWON.ON.CAN.NA | Waterloo, Ontario, CANADA

-----  
Date: Mon, 4 Jan 1993 19:18:21 GMT  
From: usc!elroy.jpl.nasa.gov!oak!laborde@network.UCSD.EDU  
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <uJZTwB1w164w@ham.almanac.bc.ca>,  
<1993Jan3.053500.18260@elroy.jpl.nasa.gov>, <1993Jan04.042108.17562@ssc.com>  
Subject : Re: 430mhz band under th

In article <1993Jan04.042108.17562@ssc.com> tad@ssc.com (Tad Cook) writes:  
>>\_PROVIDED\_IT\_IS\_NOT\_CAUSING\_INTERFERENCE\_TO\_ANOTHER\_QSO\_. While I may only  
>>be a No-Code, I can read English. All the regulations I have read and seen  
>^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^^

> Geeze.....I thought we were discussing this with someone who has long

>and distinguished experience with frequency coordination and FM repeaters!

REMEMBER that you said this. Obviously the class of my license has little to do with how much sense I make. YOU said it yourself for all the net to see.

>

>Not to diminish the talents or abilities of a new ham, but it might  
>be a good idea to ask some questions about the subject, rather than  
>making all of these dire pronouncements based upon armchair lawyering!  
>

Why are you doing it then? I can read. I have a college degree (two in fact). I spend alot of time deciphering obscurely worded government documents. Could it be the fact that you are WRONG that drives you to use this cheap and despicable offensive tactic to divert attention from the real issues? Frankly, I have met many "old and experienced" hams, some who EVEN have EXTRA (gasp!) calls, who don't know what the hell they're talking about. There are several hams making posts on this thread who are younger than you and have had their license for a shorter time than you have, making better, clearer, and more rational arguments than you. Why the hell are you picking on me? License class has no bearing on the qualification of the holder. Period. Oh, I guess if I could copy 30 wpm then everyone would be beating a path to my mountaintop to obtain the secret of life on 430 MHz.

I am not making "dire pronouncements," and you said yourself you "thought we were discussing this with someone who has long and distinguished experience with frequency coordination and FM repeaters!" Thanks for the compliment.

It would be silly for you to assume you know everything about what I do and who I know.

And I \_still\_ hope you have a nice day!

-grl.

-----

-----

End of Ham-Policy Digest V93 #5

\*\*\*\*\*